

# **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

## **Minutes**

March 9, 2006  
Salisbury, North Carolina

The Historic Preservation Commission for the City of Salisbury met in regular session on Thursday, March 9, 2006, in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 217 S. Main Street.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Michael Young.

In addition to Mr. Young, the following members were present: Raemi Evans, Ronald Fleming, Susan Hurt, Anne Lyles, Jeff Sowers, Kathy Walters, and Wayne Whitman.

Absent: Mike Fuller

Michael Young welcomed all persons present. He read the purpose and procedure for the meeting.

### **Request for Certificates of Appropriateness**

H-07-06    **128 E. Innes St.** – George Wilson, IV & George Wilson, V, owners–  
Certificate of Appropriateness for redesign of the existing storefront, and updated paint on existing front façade trim.

George Wilson and Christine Wilson were sworn to give testimony for the request.

Staff presented slides

Christine Wilson began testimony by describing the current condition of the existing storefront which they plan to redesign, and change paint colors.

She testified that there will be a new wooden insert where the storefront will become a symmetrical view. The entire insert will be painted dark green. Colors samples were submitted. An existing metal awning will be removed, as will the corrugated metal that currently covers the original transom windows. The windows will be repaired as needed and cleaned. She said the brownish red color would be used in the upper story windows with green accents. The brick will be cleaned to remove some of the grim in order to lighten a little, but it would not be a harsh cleaning, she said.

Ms. Wilson further testified that the doors will be custom-made using reclaimed oak; the door fixtures will be brass.

Michael Young led the Commission into discussion of the following Storefront guidelines:

#### Preservation

1. *Retain and preserve historic storefronts and storefront features such as entryways, display windows, doors, transoms, corner posts, etc.*

Mr. Wilson testified that the features that will be removed were added in the 60's. Kathy Walters commented, "I think it sounds wonderful," as was agreed by all Commission members.

2. *Whenever possible, retain and preserve historic materials. Avoid the removal of historic materials or architectural features. O.K.*
3. *Whenever repairing or renovating, it is recommended that any non-historic storefront or façade treatments including metal cladding or other non-historic alteration be removed. Jeff Sowers said, "That's what they're doing."*

#### Reconstruction

4. *If replacement of a deteriorated storefront or storefront feature is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, material, texture and detail. O.K.*
5. *When reconstructing a historic storefront, base the design on historical research and evidence. Maintain the original proportions, dimensions and architectural elements. O. K.*
6. *Whenever changes are required to meet building or accessibility codes, they should be done in a way that is the least intrusive to the façade and without destroying historic materials and features. O. K.*

#### New Design

7. *Where original or early storefronts no longer exist or are too deteriorated to save, retain the commercial character of the building through contemporary design which is compatible with the scale, design, materials, color and texture of the historic buildings.*

In response to Susan Hurt who asked if she had any pictures of the building that would have been made before the 1960's, Ms. Wilson said the only picture she has, though not with her, is a newspaper rendering showing the building with a 2-entry symmetrical doorway, similar to their current proposal, probably made in the 50's.

Continuing with the guidelines, Michael Young read the following Upper Façade guidelines:

#### Preservation

1. *Retain and preserve historic façades and façade details such as corbelled brick, stringcourses, cornices, windows, and stonework.*

2. *The covering of upper façades is not appropriate. Whenever possible, remove metal or other non-historic covering from upper façades.*
3. *Windows on upper floors shall be kept in their original appearance and configuration. The enclosing or bricking in of windows shall not be permitted.*
4. *When replacing upper floor windows, match the original in configuration and, where possible, materials. When replacing all windows in a certain area, it is appropriate to use aluminum or vinyl-clad, low-maintenance windows if they have the same appearance of the original windows.*

#### Reconstruction

5. *If replacement of a deteriorated façade feature is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, material, texture and detail.*
6. *When reconstructing a historic façade or feature, base the design on historical research and evidence. Maintain the original proportions, dimensions and architectural elements. If no evidence of the design of the feature exists, a new design, compatible with the overall character of the building, should be used.*

#### New Design

7. *If new construction of an upper façade is necessary, make sure that the design is compatible with the existing structures in the district including size & spacing of windows or other fenestrations, proportion, scale, and detailing.*

In response to a question from Susan Hurt, Ms. Wilson said the windows basically need maintenance; however, the pane is gone in one a window and will be replaced using the same frame.

She testified, in response to a question from Michael Young that the some of the bead board from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor would be used in the recess area. She said the paint would be removed and then stained.

Wayne Whitman asked if there would be a back entrance into the store, to which Mr. Wilson said, “No, there is not currently a back entrance.”

Ms. Wilson said they are aware that a rear egress is needed to meet the code and one would be created at some time.

Jeff Sowers commended the Wilsons for their restoration plans for the building.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the requests.

Susan Hurt made the motion as follows: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-07-06 – that George Wilson and Christine Wilson, owners of 128 E. Innes Street, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to redesign the existing storefront, and update paint on the existing front façade trim; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Storefronts, pages 20-22, guidelines 1-7; Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Upper Facades, pages 23-35, guidelines 1-7 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines;

no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-07-06 be granted to George Wilson and Christine Wilson, owners of 128 E. Innes Street to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Jeff Sowers seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-08-06 **124 E. Innes St.** – B & H Investment Group, owner – George Ortega, applicant & agent – Certificate of Appropriateness to (1) change the name on the front sign to “George Italian Grill & Bar” using same sign, same size letters, and same color; (2) add 3 small lights above the sign, connected by one line; (3) clean and paint (Burgundy) the recessed ceiling between the awning and entrance; (4) replace existing awning with new awning (Burgundy) [or remove awning from building]; (5) brick (23 ¼” x 100 ¼”) area located to the left of entrance and frame as it was originally, paint Burgundy to match overhead.

George Ortega was sworn to give testimony for the request. Staff presented slides.

Mr. Ortega informed the Commission that he would be opening an Italian Restaurant on the property. He began by testifying that he would like to change the name on the existing sign located on the front of the building to “George’s Italian Grill & Bar,” using the colors burgundy and green.

He testified that on the left side of the building, he would like repair damage to the brick by covering it with wood and painting burgundy. The recessed ceiling will be outlined with a wood molding painted Burgundy, and the underside of the ceiling will remain white.

Mr. Ortega stated that did not have a blueprint to present.

Michael Young read the following Storefront guidelines:

#### Preservation

1. *Retain and preserve historic storefronts and storefront features such as entryways, display windows, doors, transoms, corner posts, etc.* Mr. Ortega testified that the existing storefront would remain; only the Red brick would be covered with wood.
2. *Whenever possible, retain and preserve historic materials. Avoid the removal of historic materials or architectural features.* Nothing will be removed.
3. *Whenever repairing or renovating, it is recommended that any non-historic storefront or façade treatments including metal cladding or other non-historic alteration be removed.* Non-applicable.

#### Reconstruction

4. *If replacement of a deteriorated storefront or storefront feature is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, material, texture and detail.*
5. *When reconstructing a historic storefront, base the design on historical research and evidence. Maintain the original proportions, dimensions and architectural elements.*

Michael Young responded to Susan Hurt's question pertaining to the brick being covered with wood, stating that inferior brick was typically used on sections of buildings that were never intended to be exposed. The brick, he said, was probably exposed when the entrance was recessed. He further stated that in his opinion, the brick would probably be better covered in a decorative wood trim, as proposed.

Mr. Ortega informed the Commission that he did not have a sign design to present for approval; therefore, it was ruled by the Chair that the sign be approved by the minor works committee.

Mr. Ortega testified that he would be using the existing awning frame and will cover with new fabric. He did not have a sample of the fabric but would get the fabric number and call back to Wendy Spry, as was suggested by the Chair.

The following awning guidelines were read by Michael Young:

1. Awnings should be made of cloth or other woven fabric such as canvas. Metal awnings are generally not appropriate, but can be used in some instances if they are compatible with the historic character of the building. Vinyl or plastic awnings are not appropriate.
2. Base the design of new awnings on historic documentation of the building or examples from buildings of similar style and age. Awnings for new buildings should be of similar materials, size, and scale of that commonly found in the historic district.
3. Mount awnings in a manner that does not obscure or damage historic architectural features of the building. Awnings should be placed appropriately above the transom and projecting over individual window or door openings. They should fit within the window or door opening. A continuous awning is not appropriate.
4. Select awning colors that are appropriate to the design of the building.

Michael Young reiterated the fact that approval for the sign is contingent on the approval by the minor works committee, and approval of the awning will be contingent on the receipt of the Sunbrella fabric number.

In reference to Mr. Ortega's request for lights above the sign, Commission members were referred to guideline #9 from the Sign guidelines which states: *Signs illuminated from within are generally not appropriate. Lighting for externally illuminated signs should be simple and unobtrusive and should not obscure the content of the sign or the building façade.*

In response to a question from Michael Young, Mr. Ortega explained that the power source would go through the wall between the existing window.

A picture of the light fixture was shown.

With no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request, Susan Hurt made the following motion: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-08-06 – that George Ortega, applicant and agent for B & H Investment Group, owner of 124 E. Innes St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to change the name on the front sign to "George's Italian Grill & Bar" using the same design; add 3 small lights above the sign; clean and paint the recessed ceiling adding molding that matches the inside ceiling and painting White;

to cover a brick area that measures 23 ¼” by 100 ¼” located to the left of the entrance with wood and painted to match the overhead trim; and replace the awning; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted with the following conditions – that the applicant will bring the Sunbrella sample for the awning for minor work approval, and the applicant will bring a sign design for minor work approval; that the other requests which includes 3 electric lights which will be provided with electricity through the wall from the inside; painting of the ceiling over the door and the covering of the area with brick should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Storefronts, pages 20-22, guidelines 1-5; Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Setting – Signage and Awnings, pages 54-56, of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; no mitigating factors are relevant; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-08-06 be granted to George Ortega, applicant and agent for B & H Investment Group, owner of 124 E. Innes Street to make the changes detailed in the application, with the request further stated that additional design materials be presented for minor work consideration.”

(The motion as printed above is the amended motion made by Susan Hurt after Janet Gapen brought to the Commission’s attention the fact that the color of the ceiling was changed from Burgundy as stated on the application to White as was stated by Mr. Ortega in his presentation, and following a further description from Mr. Ortega of the requested molding trim on the ceiling.)

Anne Lyles seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-09-06     **230 E. Kerr St.** – Kerr Street Properties (Michael & Betty Black), owner – Certificate of Appropriateness to (1) replace unsafe, worn porch decking and railing with the existing Brown color (2) repaint exterior trim with existing color, Forest Green and Brown Red; (3) re-roof north section Emporium (5000 sq. ft.) with White rubber sheeting to eliminate leaks and conserve energy; insulate under roofing.

Mickey Black was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Staff presented slides.

Mr. Black testified that the 5000 sq. ft. area roof on the north side of the Emporium leaks and is a troublesome situation for his tenants. In addition, the roof needs to be insulated as soon as possible in order to prevent the high cost being spent for utilities. From the slides he pointed out the swayback nature of one pitch in the roof which he cited as being one example of why the roof is leaking. He further testified that because of the swayback nature of the nearly 100-year old roof, shingles will not stop the leaks, which is the reason that he is requesting solid rubber roofing material.

Mr. Black informed the Commission that the rubber sheeting is available in the colors of white and black. The black, he said, has no reflective nature and would be extremely hot in the summer.

He presented a letter from the roofer stating that it would not be economically feasible to put as much insulation as would be needed in order to use the black. Mr. Black also presented evidence to show that the roof had been white before.

From the slides Mr. Black showed the side of the building where the new roof would be located, which is a part of the roof that would not be visible. The roof on the opposite side is currently black, and there are no noticeable problems, he said.

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that very often in non-residential areas the roofs on buildings are not visible from the street which is probably the reason roofs were not addressed in the Non-Residential Historic District Guidelines.

Michael Young and Jeff Sowers both agreed that since the area to re-roof is small and is not a street frontage area, white could probably be acceptable. Other members also agreed that as long as it will not be visible from view it would be o.k.

In response to a question from Susan Hurt, Mr. Black said the insulation would be completely covered. He said the sheeting would probably be more than 2" in thickness in the places that would need to be evened out.

Referring to replacement of the porch decking, Mr. Black testified that in order to prevent anyone from getting hurt, some of the boards have already been replaced but not yet painted. He said they will be painted in the same brown color to match the existing,

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Wayne Whitman made the motion as follows: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-09-06 – that Mickey Black of Kerr Street Properties, owner of 230 E. Kerr Street appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace unsafe, worn porch decking and railing with existing Brown color; repaint exterior trim with existing colors Forest Green and Brown Red, and re-roof the existing 5000 sq. ft. section of the Emporium with White rubber sheeting to eliminate leaks and conserve energy with insulation under the roofing; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Paint, pages 38-40, guidelines 5 and 6; Chapter 3 – New Construction & Additions – Rear Decks, Terraces & Rooftop Decks, page 51, guidelines 1-5 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; there were no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be for Application #H-09-06 be granted to Mickey & Betty Black of Kerr Street Properties, owner of 230 E. Kerr Street to make the changes detailed in the application."

Ron Fleming seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-10-06     **312 S. Shaver St.** – Rigo A. Medina, owner – Certificate of Appropriateness to install rubber on 4x4 ft. area on rear of the roof because roof has no pitch.

Rigo Medina was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Staff presented slides.

Ms. Medina testified that they would like to replace the entire roof of the house with a pre-approved shingle. She informed the Commission of an addition on the house that has metal roofing, which they would like to change to the same new shingle.

In response to a question from Michael Young who inquired as to the pitch of the roof, Jeff Sowers stated that 3 and 12 is typically required for asphalt shingles in order to keep the water from getting underneath. He commented that the metal roof was probably used because it is a lower pitch roof.

Jeff Sowers read the following roof guidelines:

1. *Retain and preserve the original shape, line, pitch, and overhang of historic roofs.* Will remain the same.
2. *Retain and preserve all architectural features that are character-defining elements of the roof, such as cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and turrets.* Non-applicable
3. *Retain and preserve historic roofing material whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, use new material that matches the historic material in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture. Consider substitute material only if the original material is not technically feasible.*

Susan Hurt asked if the metal was a historic material. Michael Young stated that metal roofs would have been found on porches, and Jeff Sowers said it could also have been found on the lower pitch roofs. Ms. Medina stated that the metal roof was definitely not original to the house.

Janet Gapen explained that guideline #3 refers to contemporary substitutes that replicate the old, such as the new simulated slate in place of real slate.

Anne Lyles said, “I don’t see it as being historic, but more of an economical way to cover the roof at this time.”

There was no present to speak in support opposition to the request.

Jack Thomson, Historic Salisbury Foundation, was sworn to speak.

Mr. Thomson commented that in his opinion, material costs may or may not have been a factor. He said, however, that the amount of work that is there is minimal in relationship to the rest of the roof. He said a metal roof could last for up to 70 years, so the metal could possibly be the original material. Also, because the pitch may not be steep enough to accommodate the proposed material, he thinks they should advocate for a metal roof, whether it be a standing seam metal roof or a 5V metal roof. He further stated that the house could have been metal all over and the area that is now metal may possibly be what is left of what may have been all metal.

Ms. Medina informed the Commission that she thinks it would look a lot better for the roof to be uniform. She said, "I don't think that small portion of a metal roof on the entire house would look original or pretty." She said she would be willing to bring documentation from a roofing company to show that the pitch is sufficient for the proposed shingles.

In response to a question from Susan Hurt, Ms. Medina said she has no idea when the addition was put on.

Anne Lyles pointed out that there was no indication that any of the adjacent houses, all built in the early 1900's, had metal roofs.

Michael Young called for a motion which was made by Kathy Walters as follows: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-10-06 – that Rigo Medina, owner of 312 S. Shaver Street, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to install asphalt shingles as a replacement for a metal roof on a small 4' x 4' area on an addition on the rear of the house; that Jack Thomson appeared before the Commission to oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Roofs, pages 10-11, Guidelines 1-3 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; mitigating factors include the size of the area, the fact that it is an addition, and the fact that it is on the rear of the house; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-10-06 be granted to Rigo Medina, owner of 312 S. Shaver Street to make the changes detailed in the application."

Anne Lyles seconded the motion. Commission members Evans, Fleming, Lyles, Sowers, Walters, and Whitman voted AYE; Commission members Hurt and Young voted NO.

**H-11-06 928 N. Main St. – Ken & Caramia Helms, owner – Certificate of Appropriateness to (1) replace windows on rear 70's addition; (2) repair vinyl siding and put insulation behind it; (3) install wood picket fence in front.**

Caramia Helms was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Staff presented slides.

Ms. Helms began her testimony by informing the Commission that the siding from an addition on her home added in the 70's has blown off. She testified that she would like to repair the vinyl siding and put insulation behind it. She further testified that she would like to replace 4 windows also on the addition, which are rotten and have termite damage.

In response to a question from Kathy Walters, Ms. Helms said she would replace the windows with wood 1/1 windows to match the existing windows on the side of the house that match the original windows on the house. Ms. Walters noted that the original windows in the addition are 6/1.

Michael Young stated that it would be very helpful to see an original photograph of the house.

She informed the Commission that there are areas of the house where the vinyl siding is missing but they were not aware of it when the home was purchased. She further stated that the electrical boxes have come loose from the house because "there is no siding whatsoever on the main part of the back of the house all the way up to the 2<sup>nd</sup> story.

Michael Young read the following widows and doors guidelines:

1. Retain and preserve original windows and doors.
2. Retain and preserve openings and details of windows and doors, such as trim, sash, glass, lintels, sills, thresholds, shutters, and hardware.
3. Protect and maintain existing windows and doors in appropriate ways.
4. Repair original windows, doors, and frames by patching, splicing, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing deteriorated sections.
5. If replacement of a window or door element is necessary, replace only the deteriorated element to match the original in size, scale, proportion, pane or panel division, material, and detail.
6. Construct replacement shutters of wood, size them to window openings
7. It is not appropriate to replace windows or doors with stock items that do not fill the original openings or duplicate the unit in size, material, and design. Snap-in muntins are not appropriate replacements for true divided-light window panes.
8. It is not appropriate to replace transparent glazing in windows or doors with tinted glazing.
9. It is not appropriate to fill in existing window or door openings if it would diminish the historic character of the building.
10. It is not appropriate to replace or cover glazing with plywood.
11. It is not appropriate to introduce new windows or doors if they would diminish the original design of the building or damage historic materials and features. Keep new windows and doors compatible with existing units in proportion, shape, positioning, location, pattern, size, materials, and details.

Michael Young informed Ms. Helms that in compliance with the guidelines, once the inappropriate material is removed, she would need to go back with something other than vinyl such as wood, or perhaps hardy-board.

Ms Helms said, “then I will just repair it and I won’t take it off.”

Janet Gapen informed Ms. Helms of the Commission’s grant program, stating that her proposed project would qualify if she would remove the vinyl siding and replace it with the appropriate wood or other appropriate siding. However, Ms. Helms said the grant would not pay for what it would cost to do that. She asked why the vinyl was not removed when the historical society owned the home in the 90’s before it was sold.

Ronald Fleming asked if she would still put insulation behind the repaired siding. Ms. Helms said she would leave that up the contractor.

Ms. Helms also requested a picket fence in the front yard. She testified that the fence would be wood. Since Ms. Helms did not have more information on the fence she was advised to present the design and the materials to be used to staff for minor work approval.

There was no one present to speak in support of opposition to the request.

Susan Hurt made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-11-06 – that Caramia Helms, owner of 928 N. Main St. appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace 2 windows on the rear of a 1970’s addition, to repair part of vinyl siding that has been damaged, put installation behind the siding, the request includes a picket fence in front of the house; no one else appeared to support or oppose the request; the request to install a picket fence is being deferred for the owner to submit a design of the fence including materials; that the motion to replace the 2 windows in back should be granted, repair vinyl siding; this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Windows & Doors, pages 14-17, guidelines 1-16; Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Wood, pages 26-27, guidelines 1-11 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that the Commission specifically find that the 2 windows in the back of the house be replaced with wood, same size, same opening with 1/1 panes to further match the design of the front of the house which is the historic area of the house; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for application #H-11-06 be granted in part and deferred in part.”

Ronald Fleming seconded the motion; all members presented voted AYE.

Ms. Helms was informed that the picket fence could be approved as a minor work once the design and materials are approved.

**H-12-06 120 S. Fulton St. – Scott McCombs, owner – Certificate of Appropriateness to replace front and back porch with Tenduraplank, and minor wood repair on shutters if fixable; if not, new shutters**

Rick McCombs and Scott McCombs were sworn to give testimony for the request.

Rick McCombs informed the Commission that they would like to replace the front and back porch of their home with Tenduraplank, which they were introduced to by the person hired to replace the porches.

Mr. McCombs testified that the material is the exact same profile as tongue and groove, and if installed per the instructions will have a life-time warranty. In addition it can be painted. He informed the Commission that the material is now being used on historic homes in Charleston SC. A sample was presented.

Janet Gapen referred Commission members to the already approved guideline revisions - #6 under New Construction and Additions which states:

*Contemporary substitute materials that closely imitate historic materials maybe used on a limited basis but should not make up the majority of the finished materials on a project. In order to qualify for use in new construction, substitute materials must have a demonstrated record of overall quality and durability. The physical properties of substitute materials must be similar to those of the historic materials they mimic. When considering substitute materials the closer the element is to the viewer the more closely the material and craftsmanship should match the original. The appropriateness of substitute material shall be reviewed on an individual basis.*

She further stated that there is precedence for hardy-plank.

Jeff Sowers stated that the material does match in appearance, style, size, but it is not wood. Scott McCombs said it is 60% wood.

Kathy Walters stated that this material brings to the Commission's attention, the need the proposed changes have to the existing guidelines that cover repairs and changes to buildings.

The McCombs' stressed the fact that the porch is getting very dangerous to walk on, and the area replaced 2 years ago has started to rot already.

Michael Young made the following statement: "To approve this, we will acknowledge that it is a new material and that has not yet been addressed for changes to existing buildings and we are setting precedence today to include this in our guidelines because the proposed material does match in appearance, size, profile, and is 60% wood."

Susan Hurt made the following motion: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-12-06 – that Scott McCombs, owner of 120 S. Fulton St. appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the front and back porch floors with Tenduraplank, that Rick McCombs also appeared in support of the motion, and no one appeared to oppose this request; this request should be granted based on following findings of fact: that Tenduraplank is a majority wood product, that it is appropriate in appearance, it matches in size and profile of the existing

wood porch, that consideration of Tenduraplank has been incorporated into the Design Guidelines for new additions for changes to historic buildings; therefore, I move that the request be granted and further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-12-06 be granted to Scott McCombs, owner of 120 S. Fulton St.”

Kathy Walters seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

### ***Land for Tomorrow Campaign***

Jack Thomson began by explaining to the Commission that a lot of work is now underway toward the conservation of open lands and historic properties. He stated that the *Land for Tomorrow* Campaign has been put together by land preservationists, historic preservationists, local governments and citizens to ask the State legislature to appropriate funding for its conservation efforts toward public lands.

He continued by giving a brief overview of the campaign, stating that the campaign is starting across the state on a local level so that everyone can be as informed about the program. His goal, he said, is to get them as educated as possible so that they can move forward in confidence in making an appropriate recommendation to City Council. He informed Commission members that he would be coming back at a later time with more substantial information and to request that they approach the Council for their endorsement.

### **Minor Works**

There were no questions pertaining to the submitted approved minor works listing.

### **Other Business**

#### Documentation of 117, 119, 7 121 W. Fisher Street

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that the visits to the buildings were made on Friday, March 3<sup>rd</sup> and Monday, the 6<sup>th</sup> by a very competent team which included the following: Diane Young, who helped to identify the materials and significant elements; Sean Myers, photographer, who took numerous pictures; also, present was an architect intern from Gray Stout Studios did measurements for drawings. She said the team did not get their work completed for presentation at this meeting; however the end result will be a very thorough set of archival photographs and measured drawings that will include elevations and floor plans.

Janet Gapen continued her report by giving descriptions of the 3 building's floor plans.

In response to a question from Susan Hurt who asked if the historic materials would be salvaged, Ms. Gapen said, “I understand that that is the plan.”

She said the church is planning to salvage materials but she did not know to what extent. She said there would be materials that are easily salvageable such as doors, fixtures, and B-boards. There would be materials that are more difficult to salvage such as the granite on the exterior of the building.

Michael Young invited Dave Collins to come forward to speak on the church's plan for salvaging materials.

Dave Collins stated that the trustees will be doing an inventory with a contractor who is experienced in historic materials; however, they have not determined yet what will be done with the materials. He said, "that is all a part of the process right now."

In response to Michael Young who asked who the demolition contractor would be, Mr. Collins said Kepley is the contractor that they have on record right but a contract has not been signed yet. He said they are in the process of putting together a contract that specifically states that they do want to salvage some materials.

When asked by Michael Young if there have been any other efforts to move the buildings, Mr. Collins said that there has been an on-going effort but he has been asked not to discuss it.

Janet Gapen stated that the guidelines state that documentation should be submitted for review by the Commission before the demolition. She said she was sure it would be ready by next month's meeting.

Dave Collins asked if the documentation would prevent them from demolition before the next month's meeting.

In response to Michael Young's question as to whether they would be ready for before that time, Mr. Collins said, "possibly."

Janet Gapen informed Mr. Collins that the guidelines do read that the documentation materials do need to be in hand before demolition. She said she felt certain that she would have everything by the next meeting, to which Michael Young said, "that seems reasonable."

Dave Collins reminded the Commission that he had asked that procedures begin back in December. Janet Gapen and Michael Young both said, "we did." Janet Gapen explained that she was going on the information that was shared at prior meetings – that nothing would be pursued for at least 3-6 months.

Michael Young informed Mr. Collins that the documents would be available at the next meeting unless the Commission members felt they should proceed differently, to which there was no response.

### Appointment to Design Review Advisory Committee

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that Gray Stout has resigned from his seat on DRAC. The Rules of Procedures state that new DRAC members should be appointed by the Commission's chair. She stated recommendations can come from members of the Commission; however, Commission members could not be DRAC members.

Janet Gapen further stated that the Rules of Procedures state that the committee may include staff members and other recognized experts in the field of historic preservation. The current committee consists of 2 architects, 1 contractor, and 1 preservationist.

The following names were submitted: Chad Briesema, Chris Bradshaw, Charles Paul, Pete Bogle, Dick Hoffman, and Ed Norvell.

Janet Gapen will contact each of the persons noted to see who is interested in serving.

### Changes to Minor Works

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that when the committee met, they were able to determine that minor works in the residential guidelines had not been updated, but there had been changes made to the non-residential guidelines. The committee agreed that the minor work guidelines should be consistent between the two.

Ms. Gapen referred the members to the submitted list of changes and additions as she guided them through the list.

With no questions pertaining to the changes, Wayne Whitman made a motion to adopt the changes to minor works in both the residential and non-residential guidelines. Anne Lyles seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

Michael Young thanked the committee for their work.

### Enforcement Procedures

Janet Gapen reminded the Commission that they had requested a review of the citation procedures. The procedures were looked at and discussed by the committee on minor works.

Wendy Spry, Development Services Specialist, referred the members to Section 8.5 Civil Citations from the Zoning Ordinance, and explained the procedures for issuing a civil citation.

She stated that any appeal of a citation is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment not later than 10 days after the receipt of the 1<sup>st</sup> notice.

Ms. Spry informed the Commission that property owners that she has dealt with are usually quick to come in to request their approvals, so she has not had a problem with anyone.

Following Ms. Spry's presentation, Michael Young asked if there were recommendations from the Commission to make the process better; however, there were none.

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that the Tree Board, in re-writing their ordinance, have stated their desire to increase the amount of the 1<sup>st</sup> penalty, which is now \$50. She said the state law allows for a much higher penalty for the first citation.

Michael Young suggested that they take a closer look at what the Tree Board is recommending at the next HPC meeting and possibly suggest to City Council that they would like to see approval of the changes.

#### Demolition within a National Register Historic District

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that it has been brought to her attention that Section 7.64.1 in the City Code requires that before a building is demolished in a National Register District (not a local district) the owner is required to give the Historic Preservation Commission a 90-day written notice of the action.

She said she would make sure the housing inspector is aware of this section in the City Ordinance.

In response to a question from Michael Young, Ms. Gapen said the implication of the writing is that the request would be presented to the Commission for review, and the Commission would make Findings. She will discuss it further with the city attorney for clarification.

#### Preservation Month

Janet Gapen reminded Commission members that Preservation Month is May.

Jack Thomson informed the Commission that Preservation Month gives a great opportunity for the coalition, who is interested in educational efforts, to proceed in that direction. He named the following suggestions for Preservation Month made by the coalition: running an ad on Channel 14 inviting people to come to Salisbury; free tours of the Hall House; producing a poster of the best and show from the photo contest which is now underway. In addition, he named as ice cream social as a possibility, stating that there are many ways the month could be observed. He suggested forming an active committee.

Susan Hurt and Jeff Sowers volunteered to be the committee.

## **Minutes**

The minutes from February 9<sup>th</sup> training session, and the minutes from the regular February meeting were approved as presented upon a motion from the Chair and all members present voting AYE.

## **Adjournment**

With no other business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned.

---

Michael Young, Chairman

---

Judy Jordan, Secretary

Special Notation: Accolades, led by Raemi Evans, were extended to Anne Lyles in recognition of a community preservation award that she recently received.



